

**Mission Bay Landfill
Technical Advisory Committee
City Administration Building
12th Floor Conference Room B
April 15, 2005
10:00am to 12:00pm**

Meeting Minutes

TAC Members Present

Donna Frye
Barry Pulver
Jeffrey Gordon, MD

Dave Huntley Ph.D.
Rebecca Lafreniere
Judy Swink

David Kennedy, DDS
Brian McDaniel

TAC Members Absent

Bruce Reznik
John Wilks

Robert Tukey Ph.D.
Robert Curtis

Ben Leaf
Frank Gormlie

Interested Parties/Alternates

Scott Andrews
Susan Orlofsky
Paul Damian

Tessa McRae
Ellen Lirley

Corrine Brindley
John Fields

Staff

Steven Fontana
John Lamb

Ray Purtee
Jim Christie

Chris Gonaver
Judy Armstrong

The meeting was called to order by Councilmember Frye. Self introductions were made.

A quorum was not present. Discussion started off on an interesting web site that maps toxic chemical releases: <http://toxmap.nlm.nih.gov/toxmap/home/welcome.do>

Jim Christie and Judith Armstrong of the Environmental Services Department were introduced and recognized for doing a good job managing the files, information requests, and office administration for this site assessment project.

Follow-up From Last Meeting

Chris Gonaver passed out a printed email from Jim Peugh of the local Audubon society. In this message Jim reviewed the Merkle Report and provided comments on it. Jim did not recommend least terns be used in the ERA as an indicator species for the site conceptual model.

Approval of Minutes

A quorum was now present so the March meeting minutes were reviewed. Minutes were reviewed and approved with the following change: delete the phrase near the bottom of page 2 that reads “an existing period of groundwater modeling.”

Follow-up From Last Meeting (continued)

Chris Gonaver spoke about the documents emailed to the group that consisted of an executive summary and abstract of a Southern California Coastal Water Research Project (SCCWRP) regarding sediments at the mouths of Chollas and Paleta creeks. He then referred the group to an epidemiology study posted on the SCCWRP website entitled *Recreational Water Contact and Illness in Mission Bay California*. The basic finding was a low number of illnesses were reported. Donna Frye mentioned that she participated in the study by swimming in the bay.

An excerpt containing Mission Bay data from a 1993-1995 State Mussel Watch Program Report was passed out. The full report is available on line at the State Water Resources Control Board web site www.swrcb.ca.gov/programs/smw. While reviewing the Mission Bay data presented, it was noted that the median international standard for edible levels of arsenic were exceeded in some mussel tissue samples. Some members of the group stated that soils in the region are high in arsenic.

A question was asked “What is a ‘synthetic organic?’” Response was a manmade compound containing carbon such as a pesticide.

Susan Orlofsky requested that the Merkle report and last OEHHA letter be emailed to her. Judy Armstrong will follow up on this.

Subcommittee Report

Barry Pulver spoke on the subcommittee’s meeting yesterday. Quality control was not discussed as planned, but a follow up meeting with Hiram Sarabia will be arranged on this topic. A response to the recent OEHHA letter was discussed, but there is a need to have the previous three OEHHA letters summarized so that our response is comprehensive. Ray Purtee will get a summary to the subcommittee. Concerning background soil sampling, if a particular metal in background samples is high, this leads to dropping that metal as a COPC in the HRA. The “cleanest” background soil samples leads to the most COPC’s being kept in the HRA. So in order to take the most conservative approach, the subcommittee decided that both the Kearny soils report and background samples would be used. Two to three soil background samples would be taken in the Pike’s field area; and three to five would be taken from the south area of Fiesta Island. The results with the lowest levels of constituents would be used as “background” for purposes of identifying COPC’s.

Chris Gonaver felt that OEHHA should be told about this plan first. Rebecca LaFreniere will establish a direct verbal communication with OEHHA and SCS to facilitate such a discussion and bring to a swifter conclusion the resolution of any remaining issues.

Tessa MaRae said that in the historical review of the development of Mission Bay, Bob Gutzler could find very few areas if any that were undisturbed and that could be construed as “background.”

Chris Gonaver: the recent OEHHA letter says that background samples should be taken as close to the site as possible. Can SCS recommend any place closer than Sorrento Valley? Barry Pulver replied that the subcommittee's contention is that all soils in the Mission Bay area are disturbed, and that background levels could be high, so we should use the Kearny report's lower levels for the cleanest background.

Judy Swink asked if OEHHA was aware of all the development around the bay that has further disturbed the soils, such as highway 5, the train tracks, etc? Rebecca said yes, she recalled that the person at OEHHA that she spoke with seemed familiar with the area.

Dr. Damian suggested that to satisfy OEHHA, we could let them choose where the background samples should be taken, but what if they pick inaccessible areas for the boring rig? We could avoid this issue entirely by adding in all organics and COPC's to the HRA and not use any background samples to screen them first. OEHHA accepted this method for a NAVY project. The group decided that Dr. Damian will discuss this proposal with OEHHA, as it would be the most conservative approach in the HRA.

Barry Pulver resumed discussing the subcommittee meeting results. Landfill gas COPC's as identified by SCS were reviewed, but the subcommittee observed that methane wasn't one of them. Dr. Damian responded by saying he will recheck the gas constituent results, but though it is an asphyxiant, methane usually isn't a "risk driver."

Concerning the subcommittee's review of the groundwater sampling results, instead of comparing constituents to drinking water MCL's, SCS should use any detection of constituents in the HRA. Dr. Damian responded that this isn't usually done in a "classic" risk assessment; however, he would factor in all discovered groundwater constituents so that we overestimate risk and also incorporate the precautionary principle.

A comment was made that MCL's are economically driven goals, not health goals. Tessa responded that PHG's would be listed in the final report as a reference. A response to this statement was that some PHG's are below detection levels, so some constituents may be present but not detected. Chris Gonaver responded by saying that using MCL's or PHG's is as a reference only; ingestion during swimming is significantly less than the drinking water standard of 3 liters. A final comment on this subject was that since thallium was discovered at 1100 ppb, the amount ingested can be negligible for adverse health effects.

Tessa said that the final report will be distributed in a piecemeal fashion with the site assessment distributed by the June TAC meeting, then the risk assessments and final conclusions to follow.

Precautionary Principle and HRA

Dr. Damian gave a PowerPoint presentation on incorporating the precautionary principle in the HRA. Since the PowerPoint slides will be made available to the group, these minutes will concentrate on the questions asked and the responses made during the presentation:

Q. Will you consider some level of sensitivity analysis? A. There could be a statistical analysis, for example soil ingestion is a sensitive risk driver in a risk assessment, so a table of risk drivers for soil ingestion could be done. Arsenic would probably be on the table.

The group felt that this was something that should be in the report.

Q. What about Hiram's concerns on quality control? A. Tessa responded that QA/QC is not addressed in the HRA, but instead is in the site assessment and that she will schedule a meeting with Hiram to go over it.

Q. How will synergistic and bioaccumulation effects be addressed in the HRA? A. Marine life would be most exposed to these effects and this would have to be addressed in a future tier 2 risk assessment.

Q. There's always uncertainties present in any risk assessment. This risk assessment hinges on exposure point concentrations; have you addressed these uncertainties in the HRA? A. They have been addressed qualitatively, not quantitatively.

Q. Does the City have or collect data on recreational water users in the park? Behavior patterns of users could change over time, such as the length of stay, hours spent in the water, and the number of users present, etc. A. The City lifeguards probably would have the best information; the HRA uses swimmers which more than covers other recreational water users such as jet skiers and water skiers.

Q. If the least terns were nesting out there would it make a difference [in the ERA]? There were two fenced least tern nesting sites during the "X" games that the Merkle report doesn't show. A. No, as a fish eater they would have to be part of a tier 2 assessment. Also, Jim Peugh's review of the Merkle report showed that he felt least terns weren't the right choice for the ERA.

Public Comment

Steve Fontana informed the group that as part of yearly landfill maintenance, an area of daisies near the flyer's field is tentatively scheduled to be mowed.

A question was asked "Did we ever hear how the removal of the invasive plants went [at the east side]?" Steve answered yes; it was completed and went well.

Items for next agenda

- Status of Assessment Report by SCS

Future Meetings

City Administration Building, 12th Floor Conference Room B, 10:00am – 12:00pm

- Friday, May 20, 2005
- Friday, June 17, 2005